

Rt. 8 Frederick, Md. 21701

2/7/75

Dear Don Stanley,

Yes, I am a voice from the past. Also, I think, of the past, hewing the old traditions, hating dishonesty and inaccuracy and striving for honesty and accuracy to the degree one is capable of them.

Whatever you heard of what I said of Raznikov's writing has to be accurate, it is that terribly wrong. It is today's commonplace, mostly by the most dedicated and true believing.

Ripping off people's minds is, I believe, worse than emptying their pockets. And in the fields in which I work I am more intolerant of it because I believe they go to the integrity of society. Besides, can any representative society function on misinformation?

I know and like Chastain. We are friends. He knows - in general only - what I think of his stuff as serialized. I do not believe his theories and his facts frequently aren't. Even the simplest, like where the bundle was found as illustrated with the piece you sent. It just wasn't there at all. Nor was the Mustang where the chart shows. And these are minor.

What slight mention there was anyplace made no sense of what happened in the Supreme Court. We were there twice, both time when the State lost appeals from our successes. We (mostly Jim Lesar's imaginativeness and thoroughness) established discovery as a right under habeas corpus. The State appealed while we were exercising it. (We got about 5% of what we were entitled to under very dramatic conditions, but what a 5%!) When it lost in 6th circuit it went to the Supreme Court asking for a stay and was turned down. Then it lost both places in appealing the precedent.

Judge McRae should rule soon on whether Ray gets a trial, legally "new trial" although he's had none. It can be an anniversary for me, if it is 10 days from now. Ten years ago that day I put the last chapter of Whitewash in the mail. Then also it was a holiday weekend. We should win.

If you think Pacific News would go for any of the parts of the new book that lend themselves to it - and if they pay for what they use - I'd be interested. The Ford stuff and Dulles and company on the spooks as perjurers are comprehensible, topical and I think important. And we have been able to pay back only about half of what Lesar borrowed so we could pay the printer. Between us - with neither having a regular income - we have met and are meeting all other costs. We have them to recover and they are not, for us, inconsiderable.

In part this is why we've sent out not review copies and the media have paid us for the copies they got. Unusual but necessary. A check from The Nation for its copy today. (If they review it will be the first time of six.) They asked for it. It was not practical for me even to let the magazines know by letter of this new book. In the past it was a total waste of time and money and I've little of either. I am the entire publishing operation except for bookkeeping. No inspiration in the shipping department, either.

I'm about to go to bed. The day begins here between 4 and 5 a.m. and its is near 11. In the morning I'll package up what you asked for. The first three are slightly damaged copies. I'll ask but not insist on pay for Frame-Up and Whitewash IV, as I have with those who did not offer. If you are willing, I'll take it back in an ad when you have free space.

The books have to be ordered from me. Including by stores with which we follow normal trade practises. By mail each of the first three is \$5.25, the fourth \$6.25 and Frame-Up \$10.50. (Frame-Up is the basis of the Ray defense. I've been his investigator since. It has prevailed in court, not the usual record of an unsuccessful book from which I'll not break even if I sell all the copies I have. It could have been successful but I knew it was doomed when I arranged a TV appearance on it in New York City and Percy Foreman fled when he learned he'd confront me and the publisher wouldn't even call the papers when there was time for the a.m.s. couldn't because I had to be ready for the call.)

If the biographical data on the covers isn't enough let me know what else interests.

On ^{ear} I add that he took his District of Columbia bar exams while he ~~was~~ working on the Ray case and as of today has not taken his first case to a jury. He has argued in court. He carried the heaviest load by far in the evidentiary hearing. He and I did all the preparatory work and all the discovery. I could be wrong but I think nobody before ever prevailed against a "national security" defense against the government as we did in Civil Action 2052-73 (WW IV). I'm not a lawyer. He is an authentic expert on Freedom of Information. One of my suits, on which he wrote the appeals briefs, was cited as the first of four by the Senate as requiring the amending of the law then passed over Ford's veto.

If you can ^{not} remove the screen from the pix on the cover I'll try to remember to get them back from the printer, who hasn't returned the art work. We neither stock pix of ourselves.

Your comment on "the informational media touch in Northern California" is of national applicability. When you've read the transcript and what we did with it and then realize that it was out before the current flap on spooking and not a single paper has called and not a single one referred to it - not even a legislator has asked for it - you'll see part of what I mean. How can you ~~give~~ testimony from people who believe perjury is right and proper and the minimum requirement of true patriotism?

By the way, there was another book, Oswald in New Orleans. It is out of print. Finished mid-April 1967. Post Mortem, which I believe to be the most definitive by far, completed but I can't pay the printer. A number of other works in various stages on incompleteness. I wanted the transcript for one of them, Agent Oswald.

And although it requires considerable perseverance to know about them and find me, the early books are still selling. They provide the little income I have. Quite a switch that they are the only works available and I ~~had~~ to invent the underground book to open the subject and thus became a publisher, albeit the country's smallest.

There is satisfaction in it, particularly from the large number of wonderful letters from total strangers. But being a publisher cuts down on everything else. I was in the conclusions of a Watergate book in September and haven't been able to resume it.

These odds and end for your consideration in your projected review.

How long has it been since you heard of a review of work 10 years old - and still current?

If I ever get a speaking engagement out there, perhaps we can get together. You might be interested in what I've learned of publishers and the industry. And you might better understand my tough attitude ^{on} ~~in~~ inaccurate and misinformative writing in this field. It has destroyed all credibility where credibility counts and where there was initial and instinctive reluctance to believe anything.

Regards,

Harold Weisberg